

ME Part C

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

Child Development Services (CDS) is a quasi-governmental agency responsible for the implementation of Part C and Part B 619. As described in state statute: The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) Commissioner "shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a) (3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age." MRSA 20- A§7209(3)

CDS, as an intermediate educational unit (IEU), has nine regional locations that serve as the system point of entry for Part C and 619 and one state office. The state CDS office maintains a central data management system, system-wide policies and procedures, system wide contracts for service providers, and centralized fiscal services.

Over the course of FFY2015, CDS State IEU and system vendor spent an enormous amount of time on discovery, development, testing and deployment of our new child data system, Child Information Network Connection (CINC). As of July 1 2016, CINC went live and replaced the Case-e system.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

CDS implements the General Supervision System for Part C and Part B 619 in Maine that was developed in conjunction with MDOE. Monitoring, findings, corrections and implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Maine Unified Special Education Regulation (MUSER) are the primary responsibilities for the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director of the CDS State Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) with direction from the Part C-619 State Coordinator/ CDS State Director. All Sites are monitored, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations annually. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings. CDS State IEU has adopted the Part B due process procedures and utilizes the MDOE Due Process office to fulfill the requirements set forth by IDEA.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The Early Intervention Technical Advisor (EITA) has continued with his position with the CDS State IEU. The primary responsibility of the EITA is to provide assistance to any early intervention provider/ program in Maine, as needed or as determined, to ensure compliance with the federal Part C indicators as well as the procedures and processes required in executing a the Routines Based Early Intervention (RBEI) Model. This individual has received national certification as an RBEI trainer from Dr. Robin McWilliam.

In addition to the EITA, several state leadership representatives represent CDS on a number of state committees and on several multiagency, state-level collaborations. The EITA has also revised the Part C process document, ensured implementation of the standardized Part C forms, trained staff and contracted providers on Part C and RBEI, facilitated the Part C Professional Development Implementation Team (PCPD-IT) and have trained staff and providers on the use of CINC. The EITA and the Early Childhood Special Education Technical Advisor (ECSPEDTA) work closely together to ensure there is an understanding of roles and responsibilities in each program as related to transition and have developed materials to support the smooth transition of children who are turning 3. In January of 2016, seven Early Intervention Program Managers (EIPM) were hired to provide supervision and guidance to site level Early Intervention (EI) staff and contracted providers. An eighth EIPM was hired in March of 2016. EIPM are also responsible for conducting fidelity checks on the delivery of Part C services for all EI staff and contracted providers to ensure adherence to all components of RBEI. These individuals are located throughout the state.

CDS requested technical assistance in the areas of natural environments for birth through two, eligibility timelines, unmet needs, child outcomes, C to B transition, General Supervision System, APR, SSIP, data systems and data analysis from IDEA Data Center (IDC), Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTACenter), The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) and National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). CDS State IEU personnel participated in OSEP, Dasy, IDC, ECTACenter, and NCSI teleconferences and conferences as frequently as possible. The actions CDS took as a result of the technical assistance received was updates to policies and procedures, more detailed guidance to the field, and the major action taken was using the guidance to implement the design of CINC screens and reporting functions.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

EI is the focus of one of the goals within Maine's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Goal 4 is "To increase the percentages of children, age's birth-two, receiving timely evidence-based early intervention services in their natural environments by qualified personnel."

The objectives are (4.1) Increase the numbers of IDEA Part C teams and personnel trained in implementing evidence-based Early Intervention model and (4.2) Increase the compliance of SAUs in meeting the required steps/timelines in developing the IFSP.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The PC PDIT, now consisting of the aforementioned EIPM's, has continued the statewide implementation of RBEI, moving from initial to full implementation. Training and support on the five components of RBEI (family ecology, family-centered needs assessment, functional participation-based outcomes, support-based home visits and collaborative consultation to childcare) were provided to all existing Part C staff and contracted providers. Training modules on the same components were developed for use with new staff and contracted providers, as well as for the purpose of 'refresher' trainings for existing staff and contracted providers, and were provided on a quarterly basis throughout the state. Fidelity checks for the individual components of RBEI were implemented with the resultant data being used to determine targeted professional development needs at the CDS site level. Data related to ongoing fidelity checks will continue to be gathered and analyzed, as well as other data such as those related to Part C indicators, in order to inform the type and intensity of future professional development needs.

The PC-PDIT uses research based strategies to foster fidelity of practice to increase job satisfaction, to increase willingness of staff to try new approaches, to improve transfer of training and sustainability of new practices, to enhance efficacy and fidelity, and to enrich collaboration through development of communities of practice through ongoing mentoring and coaching practices to ensure compliance and improved results for infants, toddlers and their families.

Other initiatives members of the SLT have key roles in are:

The State Interdepartmental Early Learning and Development Team (SAIEL) serves as an administrative governance structure between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure interagency coordination, streamline decision-making, allocate resources effectively, incorporate findings from the various demonstration projects statewide, and create long term sustainability for its early learning and development reform. The Early Intervention and 619 State Coordinator is a key member of this team.

The Developmental Systems Integration (DSI) project (a subgroup of Maine Quality Counts), overall goal is to improve the rate of general developmental screening. The goal of the initiative is to improve developmental screenings across the early childhood system by generating acceptance of a set of standardized developmental screening tools used by child health and early care and education providers. Also, to implement: protocols for training requirements and administration of developmental screening tools that promote reliable and valid results, mechanisms for sharing and communicating results efficiently and securely among child health and early care and education providers, and cross-departmental policies in support of the coordinated system, including Health Home (HH) and Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) initiatives.

Maine Education Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing's (MECDHH) Community of Practice which focuses on refining the process of fully integrating professionals with expertise in working with Deaf and hard of hearing infants, toddlers and their families into CDS' Part C implementation of RBEI. This community of practice has improved the Part C system's ability to be responsive to the needs of identified infants and toddlers with regard to communication modality options, hearing assistive technology and parent support.

Early Start Maine, collaboration between CDS and the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, which has successfully integrated the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) into CDS's existing implementation of RBEI. This initiative has enabled the delivery of evidence-based ABA services, in the natural environment, to infants and toddlers with ASD and their families. The maintenance of fidelity to both ESDM and RBEI in the delivery of Early Start Maine has resulted in significant developmental gains on the part of infants and toddlers as well as the increase of caregivers' capacity to meet their child's needs.

Over the course of the reporting period CDS state leadership, regional sites staff, contracted providers and stakeholders participated in discovery, development, testing and deployment of CINC. All users of CINC recieved training by recorded webinar, live webinar and/or face-to-face between April and July. These trainings were primarily conducted or created by the Software and Training Support Specialist whom was hired to support CINC in April.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Stakeholder Involvement: ☒ apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting of targets. The SICC meets 6-10 times per year with dedicated meetings scheduled solely focus on data and reporting.

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for results indicators for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan. During FFY 2015 and through the review of the FFY 2015 SPP/APR no revisions to targets were suggested or made.

CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

Reports to the public on the performance of the regional sites (EIS programs) are within the APR. Information is reported by regional site level as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A). All information, including the SPP, is available on the CDS website at <http://www.maine.gov/doe/cds/> under Reporting.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments



Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		91.00%	95.40%	94.50%	91.00%	92.90%	99.00%	97.00%	99.00%	99.58%	99.17%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2357	2380	99.17%	100%	99.03%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

0

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting periods since a full reporting period is used (July 2015 through June 2016). The full year data has historically been used to calculate timeliness of services.

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff)	1
No available openings*	0

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

No provider available**	22
Provider interruption	0
Documented exceptional family circumstance	0
Total	23
*No available openings - Provider is available but has no time available	
**No provider available - No provider is available	

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	99.80%
CDS First Step	94.54%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	98.18%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	99.26%
CDS York	99.80%
State Totals	99.03%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005


FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		89.00%	85.00%	87.00%	90.00%	85.00%	91.00%	88.00%	98.00%	99.40%	99.89%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#). Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	897	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	908	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
897	908	99.89%	95.00%	98.79%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Target	95%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
CDS Two Rivers	98.72%
CDS Midcoast	93.55%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	96.74%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	99.39%
State Totals	98.79%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
		Data					51.50%	43.50%	42.00%	40.00%	24.00%	44.70%	55.40%
A2	2008	Target ≥						40.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%
		Data					39.70%	42.10%	52.00%	50.00%	37.00%	54.87%	60.13%
B1	2008	Target ≥						59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
		Data					59.10%	53.50%	52.00%	39.00%	37.00%	54.05%	67.73%
B2	2008	Target ≥						26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%
		Data					25.60%	26.80%	33.00%	26.00%	23.00%	33.33%	35.56%
C1	2008	Target ≥						52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
		Data					51.50%	54.70%	56.00%	51.00%	48.00%	61.11%	67.24%
C2	2008	Target ≥						37.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%
		Data					37.20%	38.60%	48.00%	43.00%	34.00%	58.28%	63.09%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target A2 ≥	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	42.00%
Target B1 ≥	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%
Target B2 ≥	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%
Target C1 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target C2 ≥	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	39.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	479.00
--	--------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6.00	1.26%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	145.00	30.40%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	116.00	24.32%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	106.00	22.22%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	104.00	21.80%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	222.00	373.00	55.40%	53.00%	59.52%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	210.00	477.00	60.13%	41.00%	44.03%

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5.00	1.04%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	121.00	25.26%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	222.00	46.35%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	97.00	20.25%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	34.00	7.10%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	319.00	445.00	67.73%	60.00%	71.69%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	131.00	479.00	35.56%	27.00%	27.35%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5.00	1.05%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	126.00	26.42%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	127.00	26.62%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	151.00	31.66%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	68.00	14.26%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	278.00	409.00	67.24%	53.00%	67.97%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	219.00	477.00	63.09%	38.00%	45.91%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites						
	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2
Target	53%	41%	60%	27%	53%	38%
CDS Aroostook	63.6%	41.9%	79.3%	29.0%	75.0%	41.9%
CDS Reach	60.5%	44.7%	74.8%	25.7%	70.2%	48.0%
CDS First Step	60.4%	33.3%	67.2%	20.6%	56.4%	33.3%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Two Rivers	67.6%	46.2%	74.3%	33.3%	78.8%	52.6%
CDS Midcoast	57.6%	53.1%	60.0%	34.0%	65.9%	52.0%
CDS Opportunities	72.0%	66.7%	90.9%	30.6%	86.7%	50.0%
CDS PEDS	75.9%	51.4%	71.4%	33.3%	73.1%	60.0%
CDS Downeast	33.3%	37.9%	52.0%	41.4%	53.8%	34.5%
CDS York	43.6%	25.6%	69.8%	11.6%	56.4%	39.5%
State Totals	59.52%	44.03%	71.69%	27.35%	67.97%	45.91%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥					89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data			76.00%	85.00%	88.00%	76.00%	90.00%	88.00%	96.57%	96.41%	97.74%
B	2006	Target ≥					89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data			85.00%	79.00%	92.00%	82.00%	92.00%	88.00%	96.59%	95.96%	98.19%
C	2006	Target ≥					89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data			88.00%	85.00%	92.00%	82.00%	92.00%	94.00%	97.56%	95.07%	97.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Target C ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	217.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	208.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	215.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	208.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	213.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	210.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	212.00

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	97.74%	91.00%	96.74%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	98.19%	91.00%	97.65%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	97.29%	91.00%	99.06%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Data were collected in the spring of 2016. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey via a telephone call. 977 Part C families were contacted to complete the survey and 217 responded, yielding a response rate of 22.21%. This response rate is relatively similar to FFY 2014 response rate of 23.47%. Analyses of representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity were conducted, and respondent data was found to be representative of the CDS population.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites			
	A	B	C
Target	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
CDS Aroostook	100%	100%	100%
CDS Reach	96.15%	100%	98.08%
CDS First Step	100%	95.00%	100%
CDS Two Rivers	90.91%	90.91%	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%	100%	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%	93.33%	100%
CDS PEDS	100%	100%	96.97%
CDS Downeast	100%	100%	100%
CDS York	90.00%	95.00%	100%
State Total	96.74%	97.65%	99.06%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.80%	0.85%	0.75%	0.77%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%
Data		0.65%	0.64%	0.71%	0.52%	0.64%	0.52%	0.63%	0.70%	0.63%	0.65%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.83%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	80	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	12,863	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
80	12,863	0.65%	0.82%	0.62%



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	0.82%
CDS Aroostook	1.05%
CDS Reach	0.40%
CDS First Step	0.55%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Two Rivers	0.27%
CDS Midcoast	0.79%
CDS Opportunities	1.11%
CDS PEDS	0.43%
CDS Downeast	1.15%
CDS York	0.73%
State Total	0.62%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005


FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.91%	2.43%	2.55%	2.67%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%
Data		2.89%	2.51%	2.38%	2.29%	2.29%	2.37%	2.49%	2.42%	2.17%	2.30%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#). Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	908	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	38,725	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
908	38,725	2.30%	2.81%	2.34%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	2.81%
CDS Aroostook	2.52%
CDS Reach	2.79%
CDS First Step	2.60%
CDS Two Rivers	1.41%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Midcoast	2.61%
CDS Opportunities	1.40%
CDS PEDS	2.08%
CDS Downeast	3.22%
CDS York	2.75%
State Total	2.34%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		94.40%	91.00%	91.10%	70.00%	64.60%	85.00%	88.00%	89.00%	82.52%	74.48%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
585	719	74.48%	100%	81.36%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☒ State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff	106
Provider	28
Total	134

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	94.87%
CDS Reach	77.69%
CDS First Step	65.45%
CDS Two Rivers	97.87%

4/27/2017

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Midcoast	85.11%
CDS Opportunities	92.31%
CDS PEDS	88.71%
CDS Downeast	95.74%
CDS York	73.47%
State Total	81.36%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		69.00%	69.00%	83.50%	79.00%	86.60%	87.00%	94.00%	99.00%	99.81%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
658	658	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
CDS Two Rivers	100%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	100%
State Total	100%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Data from the full reporting year of FFY 2013 was used to identify findings of noncompliance during the FFY 2014. The regional site was notified of the noncompliance on June 18, 2015 and subsequently had one year to correct the finding. The finding has been corrected and verified consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA



Yes



No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
658	658	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	100%
State Total	100%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	87.00%	60.00%	56.00%	94.80%	93.00%	77.00%	83.00%	83.46%	83.85%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

-  Yes
-  No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
528	658	83.85%	100%	80.24%



Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0

Explanation of Slippage

Despite continued efforts the data for FFY 2015 show slippage in compliance relative to FFY 2014. The slippage may be due to the lack of understanding in the EI system regarding the requirements of the transition conference and who must participate. Service coordinators understood that Part B must be in attendance to hold the conference. In addition CDS has had difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified EI staff.

To address the slippage targeted technical assistance will be provided to the Regional Sites.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	93.33%
CDS Reach	90.96%
CDS First Step	78.95%
CDS Two Rivers	92.86%
CDS Midcoast	64.62%
CDS Opportunities	84.85%
CDS PEDS	81.97%
CDS Downeast	66.67%
CDS York	69.70%
State Total	80.24%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2014 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0%	0%	0%	5.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
Data				0%							


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	7.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0		6.00%	

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data			100%		100%			100%	100%	100%	


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0		85.00%	

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target			
Data			

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target			

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Janna Gregory

Title: CDS Deputy Director

Email: janna.gregory@maine.gov

Phone: 207-624-6660